

5090
Ser 1811GM/L3156
29 JAN 1993

From: Commander, Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Distribution

Subj: NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES

Encl: (1) Progress Review Meeting Minutes of January 15, 1993

1. Enclosure (1) provides the minutes of our Progress Review meeting held on January 15, 1993 at the Naval Air Station Alameda.

2. If you have any questions, please contact either Mr. Gary J. Munekawa, Code 1811GM, (415) 244-2524 or Mr. George Kikugawa, Code 1811GK, (415) 244-2559.

Original signed by:

LOUISE T. LEW
By direction

Distribution:

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (Attn: Tom Lanphar)
California Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: James Nusrala)
US Environmental Protection Agency (Attn: Julie Anderson)

Copy to:

NAS Alameda (Attn: Lt. Mike Petouhoff)
COMNAVBASE San Francisco (Attn: Randy Friedman)
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Duane Balch)
James M. Montgomery Consulting Engineers (Attn: Ken Leung)

Blind copy to:

1811, 1811GM, 1811GK
Admin Record (w/3 copies)
Chron, blue, pink, green
WRITER: G. Munekawa/1811GM/X2524
TYPIST: George Munekawa
FILE: Alameda/NAS

**MONTHLY PROGRESS REVIEW MEETING MINUTES
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION/FEASIBILITY STUDY
NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA
(Held at Building 114, NAS Alameda)**

January 15, 1993

Attendees:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Tom Lanphar	Dept. Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	(510) 540-3809
James Nusrala	Regional Water Quality Control Board	(510) 286-0301
Kenneth Leung	J.M. Montgomery (JMM)	(510) 975-3460
Rich Halket	JMM	(510) 975-3518
Mike Petouhoff	Naval Air Station (NAS) Alameda	(510) 263-3726
Randy Cate	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3716
Sherri Withrow	NAS Alameda	(510) 263-3724
Duane Balch	PRC Environmental Management, Inc.	(916) 852-8300
Gary Munekawa	U.S. Navy, Western Div. (WESTDIV)	(415) 244-2524
George Kikugawa	WESTDIV	(415) 244-2559

AGENDA ITEMS:

I. Overview of NAS Alameda Installation Restoration Program

A. Project History (includes explanation of "Phases")

- Sherri Withrow presented a slide show summary of the history and historic use of NAS Alameda, and along with Randy Cate, explained the general function and relationship of the NAS Alameda Environmental Engineering Branch group to the Installation Restoration Program activities managed by WESTDIV.
- A general discussion of the eight phases of the RI/FS was conducted. Future work at the Phases 1 and 2A, Phases 2B and 3, and Phases 5 and 6 sites will be combined, along with the Phase 4 ecological assessment field work, into the RI document to be generated under Phase 7. Phase 8 encompasses the generation of the feasibility study document and completion of the RI/FS study at NAS Alameda.

B. Review of Sites under Investigation (includes past results)

- Ken Leung of JMM presented a brief summary of history of the site investigations conducted to date at Sites 1 through 20. Handouts were circulated that provided a listing of the sites under discussion, as well as cross-referencing the data summary reports and other documents covering past investigations by the PRC and JMM team.

II. Status of Ongoing Investigations

A. Phases 1 and 2A

1. Data Quality Issues

- The Navy indicated that it had submitted on January 8, 1993, a written discussion/chronology of the history of the DTSC's review of the quality assurance project plan (QAPP) for the RI/FS at NAS Alameda, in which was discussed data quality control issues, and the issues of the validation of analytical data collected by Canonie during the Phases 1 and 2A site investigations in 1990. The Navy's position was that the QAPP did not require 100 percent validation of the Canonie data, and that there had been an internal decision between the Navy and its new contractors (PRC and JMM) to attempt to provide the same level of validation on the Canonie data as was subsequently being performed on the Phases 2B and 3, and Phases 5 and 6 analytical data.
- Tom Lanphar of the DTSC indicated that he was preparing a response to the Navy's January 8, 1993, letter, and that he would have formal written responses to the draft Phases 1 and 2A data summary report (DSR) in a separate letter within a few weeks.
- Lengthy discussion was conducted concerning the Canonie data generated for the Phases 1 and 2A investigation. Specifically, that the laboratories used by Canonie were DTSC-certified and that they would have followed standard lab quality control procedures. That data validation packages were likely generated by Canonie on five percent of the analytical data, but that they were not called out as deliverables under the Navy contract with Canonie at that time. Data validation packages found thus far at the former Canonie laboratory in Stockton are very fragmented, and the necessary quality control documentation has not been archived together in any single storage file. It was discussed that great additional effort and expense would be required in any attempt to collect and collate the laboratory quality control documentation from the eleven labs used by Canonie.
- It was agreed that the Canonie analytical data values as reported in the Phases 1 and 2A DSR were qualitatively useful, but that the DTSC would provide a future written statement concerning the suitability of the data for site screening, locating future data gathering sites, and risk assessment. It was also suggested that DTSC toxicologist Jim Polisini review the results of the Phases 1 and 2A data to assess the suitability as in future risk assessment work, as this would help define how "aggressive" subsequent sampling activities would be during the additional field work at the Phases 1 and 2A sites.

2. Finalization of Data Summary Report

- A draft copy of the Phases 1 and 2A DSR was submitted to the DTSC on December 2, 1992. An additional copy was distributed to Ms. Jan Baxter of the RWQCB. It was decided that while the DTSC and RWQCB finished their reviews, the Navy would distribute the same document as a draft final DSR to the other appropriate agencies

and individuals. Distribution of the December 2, 1992 draft final Phases 1 and 2A DSR will occur by January 29, 1992.

3. Additional Field Investigation Scope of Work

- At a December 10, 1992, meeting with the DTSC, the Navy submitted a draft scope of work (SOW) for generating a work plan for additional field work at the Phases 1 and 2A sites. The DTSC did not offer any adverse comments to the suggested SOW. The Navy will begin contracting procedures with PRC to initiate the SOW.

B. Phases 2B and 3

1. Second Round Sampling Addendum Report Status

- Tom Lanphar of the DTSC indicated that he would be finishing up his review of the second round sampling addendum report within the next few weeks. Upon satisfactorily responding to DTSC comments, the second round sampling addendum report will be added as an appendix to the Background and Tidal Influence/Additional Work at Sites 4 and 5 report (Mod 1 report), submitted in draft final form August 4, 1992. After inclusion of regulatory comments, this document will then be issued as a final report.

2. Site 5 Additional Sampling/Health & Safety Issues

- Additional sampling issues at the plating shop in Site 5 were discussed, as was the possibility of doing Level B work due to cyanide levels previously measured within the plating shop. Additional sampling within Site 5 is required to complete the scope of work originally intended for inclusion in the Mod 1 report. Additional sampling will be conducted after funding becomes available to accomplish this activity. The presence of plating shop process fluids in the subfloor of the plating shop prevented completion of field work at this site last summer.

3. Status of Additional Field Activities/Work Plan

- The Navy finished contractual activities with PRC and JMM in late December for the preparation of work plan documents for performing additional work at the Phases 2B and 3 sites. This work will tentatively start in late January 1993.

C. Phase 4

1. Update/Planned Activities

- The ecological assessment (EA) field work is slated to start the week of January 18, 1993, weather permitting. The firm contracted by PRC to do the EA, Kinnetics, has already begun its review of existing documentation in preparation of EA activities.

D. Phases 5 and 6

1. Response to Comments, Final SWAT Report

- The Navy received DTSC comments to the SWAT report in a letter dated December 2, 1992, and provided the DTSC and the RWQCB a

copy of the Navy's responses in a letter dated January 14, 1993 (this letter was hand delivered to Tom Lanphar and James Nusrala during the meeting). Following DTSC review of the Navy's responses, the agency comments and Navy responses will be incorporated into the final SWAT report for final distribution.

2. Status of Additional Field Activities/Work Plan

- The Navy finished contractual activities with PRC and JMM in late December for the preparation of work plan documents for performing additional work at the Phases 5 and 6 sites. This work will tentatively start in late January 1993.

E. Phases 7 and 8

1. RI/FS Work Plan Revision

- The Navy finished contractual activities with PRC and JMM in late December for the preparation of a work plan addendum to summarize the revisions for the existing RI/FS work plan documents prepared by Canonie between late 1988 and 1990. This work will tentatively start in late January 1993.

III. RI/FS Schedule

A. Issues and Assumptions

- As discussed with the DTSC in August 1992, a tentative target date for meeting to discuss a revised RI/FS schedule had been set for January 27, 1993. Due to budgetary constraints within the Navy, several activities expected to occur in the fall of 1992, were delayed. It was proposed that the meeting be delayed, and Tom Lanphar concurred that the meeting could be delayed until February 18, 1993 (since rescheduled to February 19, 1993). It was suggested that, at least for the short term, a schedule for activities that had been recently funded by the Navy could be provided for the DTSC that would cover the next 3 to 4 months (through April or May 1993). A schedule would also be provided for work not yet awarded, but that will be started when funding becomes available.
- Tom Lanphar stated that a schedule is required as part of the June 1988, Remedial Action Order for NAS Alameda.
- It was suggested that progress review meetings for the RI/FS at NAS Alameda be held monthly, with the next meeting at NAS Alameda on February 19, 1993, at 0900 hours.

IV. Response Action Activities

A. Intermediate Maintenance Facility (IMF) Site

1. Free-product Removal

- Free-product removal activity will start in February 1993, while the NAS Alameda facility conducts soil removal activities at Building 397. These activities are being conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) under agreement with the Navy.

2. Soil pH/Lead Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA)

- The Navy finished contractual activities with PRC and JMM in late December for the preparation of an engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA) for soils containing elevated levels of lead and having a low pH, at former Harding Lawson boring B-7. This work will tentatively start in late January 1993.

3. JP-5 Release/Excavation Activity at Building 397

- NAS Alameda has contracted with the ACOE for excavation of JP-5 impacted soils at Building 397. Field work activities are scheduled to start on February 8, 1993.

V. Investigation-Derived Waste Management

- It was agreed that the Navy will meet with the DTSC to discuss future investigation-derived waste (IDW) management, to facilitate timely handling of all IDW to be generated during proposed additional field work activities.

VI. Field Trip (weather allowing)

- A brief drive to Site 13 (the former oil refinery), the IMF facility site, and Building 397 was conducted. Rainy conditions prevented visiting other facility sites included in the RI/FS.

The next NAS Alameda RI/FS Progress Review Meeting is scheduled for February 19, 1993, at the DTSC office in Berkeley at 0900 hours.